



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/524,160

03/10/2006

Olaf Kersten

1179 033

4000

72742

7590

01/22/2009

Hiscock & Barclay, LLP
One Park Place
300 South State Street
Syracuse, NY 13202-2078

EXAMINER

NICHOLS II, ROBERT K

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3754

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

01/22/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/524,160	Applicant(s) KERSTEN, OLAF	
	Examiner ROBERT K. NICHOLS II	Art Unit 3754	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 October 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 21-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 21-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This office action is responsive to the amendment filed on 10/28/2008. As directed by the amendment: claims 21 and 36 have been amended, claims 1-20 were previously cancelled, and no new claims have been added. Thus, claims 21-41 are presently pending in this application.

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: In paragraph 20, reference characters "9" and "10" have both been used to designate an appendage. In paragraph 20, lines 4 and 12 applicant refers to reference numeral "10" as an appendage, and in paragraph 20, lines 8-9 applicant refers to reference number "10" as the truncated shaped end area. It is suggested Applicant use consistent terminology to avoid confusion.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Art Unit: 3754

Regarding claim 26, the phrase “preferably” renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 21-25 and 27-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Geier et al. (US 5,630,530) in view of Strassmann (US 6,127,009).

Regarding claims 21, 25, 29 and 31, Geier discloses a discharge valve including a sack or bag 24 of flexible film material, wherein the sack is bonded in a border area in two superimposed layers. Geier further discloses a receptacle body or delivery nozzle 58 wherein portion 34 is bonded in the border area between the two layers of the film material (see figure 2, column 5, lines 27-30 and abstract). Geier further discloses the receptacle body 58 includes a surface or sleeve being made from a material permeable to organic media (i.e. polyethylene or polypropylene) and the sack being made from a material permeable to organic media (i.e. polyethylene or polypropylene); wherein the

Art Unit: 3754

receptacle body material can be bonded to the sack material (see column 5, lines 25-30, column 4, lines 12-20 and column 2, lines 29-31).

Furthermore, Geier discloses the sack being able to be placed into a container 22 through an opening 23 which is closable by a valve cap or lid 25 whereby the valve cap 25 holds a valve stem 14 with a valve needle or discharge nozzle 18 which is axially movable out of a closed position against the force of an elastic element or coil spring 20 (column 3, lines 53-65 and column 4, lines 25-31).

Geier further discloses a valve stem or valve body 14 which is made of a synthetic material that is essentially impermeable to organic media and includes a tubular section, the receptacle body 58 having a tubular appendage 44 and the valve stem 14 having a receptacle as a counterpart, in order to connect the receptacle body and valve stem with each other using a clamp connection (see figure 2, column 2, lines 26-34 and column 4, lines 52-60).

Geier additionally discloses a gasket or sealing ring 32 having a shape of a flat ring arranged between the receptacle body and valve stem, wherein the gasket 32 at least partially covers the frontal or bearing surface 40 of the receptacle body 58 on its side facing the valve stem 14, wherein the diffusion of organic media is prevented by the gasket and the valve stem (see figure 2 and column 4 lines 61-67). The examiner notes Geier discloses the impermeable valve stem is provided with additional sealing means 32 which seals the bag off completely from the interior of the container. Geier further discloses an exchange

Art Unit: 3754

of individual materials, in particular organic media between the interior of the bag and its surroundings is effectively prevented (column 1, lines 58-61).

Regarding claim 22, Geier discloses the appendage 44 having a tubular section with a widened end section (see figure 2 and column 4, lines 52-60).

Regarding claim 23, Geier discloses the end section narrows in a truncated shape towards its free end (see figure 2).

Regarding claim 24, Geier discloses the receptacle of the valve stem 14 to have a step in its opening section that reduces the diameter (see figure 2 and column 4, lines 52-60).

Regarding claim 27, Geier discloses a circumferential tapered ring on the side of the receptacle body 58 facing the valve stem 14 (see figure 2 and column 4, lines 52-60).

Regarding claim 28, Geier discloses the receptacle body 58 to have a tapered-oval cross section 44, whose tips point to the bonding seam 46 of the sack (see figure 2 and column 4, lines 12-20).

Regarding claim 30, Geier discloses all the elements of the claimed invention except the appendage being formed on the valve stem and the receptacle being provided with the receptacle body.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the valve stem with the appendage and the receptacle body with the receptacle, since it has been held that a mere reversal of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Einstein*, 8 USPQ 167

Regarding claim 32, Geier discloses the film material is coated on its bonded side with at least one of PE, PET and PP (see column 4, lines 12-17, column 5, lines 27-30 and abstract).

Regarding claim 33, Geier discloses the receptacle body 58 surface to be made out of one of PBT, PE and PP (column 3, lines 18-25).

Regarding claim 34, Geier discloses the receptacle body 58 and the bonded side of the film material to be made out of one of the following material combinations: PBT and PET, PE and PE, and PP and PP (column 3, lines 18-25 and column 4, lines 12-20).

Regarding claim 35, Geier discloses the valve housing to be made out of POM (column 3, lines 18-25).

With further regards to claims 21, 28, 32 and 34, Geier discloses the present invention with the exception of welding being used as the means of bonding.

Strassmann teaches a dispensing unit having a flexible bag bonded to a body by means of welding, in order to form a tight sealing seam that is durable under thermal conditions (see figure 2, column 5, lines 50-54 and column 6, lines 7-16).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide welding as the bonding means in the device of Geier, as taught by Strassmann, in order to provide a tight sealing seam that is durable under thermal conditions.

Claims 26 and 36-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Geier et al. (US 5,630,530) in view of Strassmann (US 6,127,009) as applied to claims 21-25 and 27-35 above, further in view of Jacobson et al. (US 4,482,170).

Regarding claims 26, 36-38 and 41 the combination device of Geier and Strassmann discloses all the elements of the claimed invention but is silent to the material of the gasket.

Jacobson teaches the use of a resilient gasket or seal 36 being of a BUNA synthetic rubber in order to provide a gas impermeable seal between two members 36/38 (see column 3, lines 28-30 and 61-63).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have constructed the gasket of the combination device of Geier and Strassmann of flexible material being BUNA, as taught by Jacobson, in order to provide an impermeable seal between two members.

Notwithstanding, It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have constructed the gasket of BUNA, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416.

Regarding claims 39 and 40, the combination device of Geier, Strassmann and Jacobson discloses all the elements of the claimed invention except for the width of the welding seams on the sack being at least 5mm and being approximately 10 to 14mm. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the sack of the combination device of Geier, Strassmann and Jacobson with welding seams on the sack having a width being at least 5mm and being approximately 10 to 14mm, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments submitted under "REMARKS" in the response filed on 10/28/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Features of Applicant's claimed invention are disclosed as illustrated in this office action.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ROBERT K. NICHOLS II whose telephone

Art Unit: 3754

number is (571)270-5312. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Friday 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin Shaver can be reached on 571-272-4720. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/R. K. N./
Examiner, Art Unit 3754

/Kevin P. Shaver/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 3754